

REMARKS

Claims 5, 6 and 10 have been amended. Claims 8 and 9 have been canceled and claims 25 and 26 have been added. Claims 10-15 have been rewritten in independent form. Claims 1-7, 10-15, 25 and 26 are pending.

Responsive to the restriction requirement, the Applicants affirm the election of the invention of Group I (claims 1 to 15) drawn to a method/apparatus for adjusting the threshold of a CMOS radiation-measuring device. Claims 16-24 are withdrawn as drawn to a non-elected invention.

Please note that the Office Action Summary incorrectly indicates that claims 17-24 are withdrawn from consideration and that claims 10-16 are objected to. The correct claim numbers are 16-24 and 10-15, respectively. The Detailed Action has the claim numbers recited correctly.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 10-15 include allowable subject matter. As suggested by the Examiner, claim 10 has been rewritten in independent form. Therefore, claims 10-15 should be allowed.

The Applicants submit the following comments concerning the Examiner's Allowable Subject Matter at page 6 of the office Action. It is the subject matter of each claim as a whole that is patentable, not any particular feature recited in the claim(s). The Applicants do not concede that the reasons for allowability given by the Examiner are the only reasons that make the claims allowable and do not make any admission or concession concerning the Examiner's statement on page 6 of the office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 5 was rejected because the element "the CMOS radiation-measuring circuit" lacked antecedent basis. Claim 5 has been amended to recite "the radiation-measuring circuit." Antecedent basis is found in independent root claim 1.

Claim 6 was rejected because the phrase "integrated voltage source" was unclear. Claim 6 has been amended to recite "a voltage source that is integrated with the radiation sensor." This clarifies that the radiation sensor comprises a voltage source. Support is found in the specification at page 6, lines 5-16. No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections of claims 5 and 6.

Claim Objections

Claim 8-10 were objected to for informalities. Claims 8 and 9 have been canceled and claim 10 has been rewritten in independent form, as described above, making the objections moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Application No. 2001/0019285 of Lin et al. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art disclosure each and every element of a claimed invention. The present claim recites, "adjusting a threshold level of a radiation sensor in a radiation-measuring circuit." Claim 1. Thus, the present application discloses and claims the elements of a radiation sensor in a radiation-measuring circuit.

In contrast, the Lin et al. reference discloses adjusting a threshold level of a MOSFET. *See, for example*, Abstract and paragraph [0033]. Lin et al. does not disclose use of a radiation sensor in a radiation measuring circuit.

Further, in Lin et al. there is no suggestion of a radiation sensor or a radiation-measuring circuit. The Lin et al. disclosure teaches a method and circuit for biasing transistors to increase performance with less associated leakage current in a larger circuit that senses when a signal is propagating toward the circuit path. There is motivation disclosed in Lin et al. for adjusting the threshold of a MOSFET of a radiation sensor in a radiation measuring circuit.

Because Lin et al. does not disclose each and every limitation of the claimed invention, Lin et al. does not anticipate the present application.

Applicant : Keshavarzi et al.
Serial No. : 10/024,467
Filed : December 17, 2001
Page : 9 of 9



Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-678001 / P13211

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2-6 and 9 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record but not relied upon has not been discussed because those references did not form the basis for rejecting any claims of the present application.

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims.

Enclosed is a \$120 check for excess claim fees. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Date: 7/22/03

Respectfully submitted

Paul A. Levy
Attorney for INTEL CORP.
Reg. No. 45,748

Fish & Richardson P.C.
4350 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92122
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

30155696.doc

RECEIVED
JUL 30 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800